To my feathered companion Henry Fonda, who supervised the completion of this thesis from his perch on my shoulder.

University of Alberta

Redefining Genre: Classifying Reading Orientations

by

Michelle Gregus

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Department of Psychology

Edmonton, Alberta
Fall 2005

0-494-09037-5

Library and Archives Canada

Published Heritage Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et Archives Canada

Direction du Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*
ISBN:
Our file *Notre référence*
ISBN:

NOTICE:
The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:
L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Abstract

Conventional views of genre classify fictional texts on the basis of textual features but these approaches risk the dissociation of genre definitions from the reading activities of real readers. The present study considers reading engagement within the combination of experiences surrounding reading in an initial empirical examination of genre understood as types of reading orientation. In the study, 163 participants completed a two-part questionnaire that asked about the memorable aspects of their experience of reading fiction. Cluster analysis revealed six polythetic classes of reading orientation, each with a characteristic profile of reasons for reading. Ludic exploratory and educational exploratory readers were found to be associated with other-oriented and self-oriented forms of reading engagement, respectively. For self-designated literary fiction readers, self-perceptual depth was associated with using fiction to escape, whereas for self-designated popular fiction readers, self-perceptual depth was associated with using fiction to learn about other cultures. The results give indication of how readers understand their orientations within particular reading events, as well as pointing to their association with distinctive reading outcomes, in a novel study of genre.

Table of Contents

Introduction **1**

Approaches to Genre 1
The "Objectivity" of Genre 3
Reading Orientations and Conceptions of Genre 5
Empirical Study of Genre 7
Current Study 9

Methods **9**

Participants 9
Procedure 10
Materials 10

Results **13**

Identifying Types of Reading Orientation 13
Identifying Reader Types 25
Forms of Reading Engagement 25
Associations Between Reader Types and Text Types 28
Influence of Text Type 29

Discussion **29**

Evaluating the Reading Orientation Approach 29
Reading Orientations and Reader-Designated Text Types 33
Reader Orientations and Reader-Designated Text Types 34
Forms of Reading Engagement 36
Reading Engagement as Memorability 38
Influence of Text Type 40
Considering Self-Perceptual Depth for Literary and Popular Fiction 41
Future Research 45

References **48**

Appendix A: Reading Fiction: A Questionnaire, Part I and Part II **50**

Appendix B: Correspondence between Reading Orientations and Reader-Designated Text Labels **66**

List of Tables

Table 1. Reading Orientation Clusters.....15
Table 2. Reading Orientation Agreement with Non-Expert-Designated Text Labels...18
Table 3. Reading Orientation Agreement with Expert-Designated Text Labels.....19
Table 4. Correlates of Reading Engagement for Ludic Exploratory and Educational Exploratory Groups.....27

Redefining Genre: Classifying Reading Orientations

Works of fiction are widely grouped by genre, as the aisles of any bookstore or library will attest. A book is situated among others that are seemingly of the same "kind," and cannot stand alone. Text classification has diverse consequences for the reader. Popular fiction may be perceived as a form of diversionary entertainment, whereas literary fiction is often viewed as intellectual engagement. However, such associations are based more on recurrent conjecture than on careful examination of reading experience. Further empirical investigation of reading and of the approach that readers take to different texts is needed to inform comparisons between popular and literary fiction as readers understand them. The goal of the current study is to elucidate the effects of these two categories of fiction while examining the problem of genre, as determined by convention, by experts, and, most importantly, by readers themselves.

Approaches to Genre

The traditional approach to genre posits a system of classification that divides individual texts into types and sub-types. Until recently, this approach was the norm within literary and media studies. As noted by Allen (1989):

> [F]or most of its 2000 years, genre study has been primarily nominological and typological in function…[it has entailed] the division of the world of literature into types and the naming of those types much as the botanist divides the realm of flora into varieties of plants.

Accordingly, the organization of the natural world has served as a model for the taxonomy of fiction. Traditionally, nineteenth century literary theory attempted to locate literature within dramatic, lyric, and narrative categories as universal genres (Fowler, 1989). The categorization of individual works within genres was based primarily on

textual features, an ongoing practice that has been extended beyond literary theory into areas such as media and culture studies. In film studies, for example, it is common to divide films into genre types on the basis of "familiar, codified, conventionalized and formulaic story structures" (Knight, 1994). Conventionalized "story structures" may be used to group films into categories such as drama, comedy, science fiction, or some combination thereof.

However, even biological systems are not as unambiguous as their scientific status would make them seem. The divisions between species are often blurry, and boundaries not fixed. Literary taxonomies have encountered comparable problems. It has proved impossible to get consensus on the "necessary and jointly sufficient" textual features that define a text as belonging to a particular group (Chandler, 1997). It has also been impossible to find texts that exhaustively contain the features assigned to a particular genre or to find texts belonging to one genre that do not overlap with the features of another. The essentialist assumptions often (falsely) associated with a scientific system may serve to obfuscate text classification. As it stands, "there are no undisputed 'maps' of the system of genres within any medium" (Chandler, 1997).

To address the difficulties inherent in the form of text classification that is dependent on necessary and sufficient features, contemporary theory has turned to text categorization based on family resemblances or prototypicality (e.g., Rosch, 1975; Wittgenstein, 1958). These approaches conceive of genres as "fuzzy categories" that cannot be defined by necessary and sufficient conditions (Chandler, 1997). More flexible perspectives such as these are better able to accommodate texts that defy essentialist

categorization. Common to these approaches is the search for polythetic, rather than monothetic, modes of categorization. Members of polythetic classes share numerous features; each feature is only more or less characteristic of the members of the class; and, as a result, no feature is necessary for class membership (Beckner, 1959). Membership in a class is determined by the extent to which instances of the class possess attributes in common, not by an a priori positing of a prototype. Categories emerge from the empirical comparison of texts to determine the number of characteristics they share.

If the process of genre investigation involves the comparative identification of polythetic classes, types of genre may be defined not only by virtue of the features that are usually present in instances of the class but also by the features that are usually absent among instances of the class but typically present in other classes. This is one sense in which the search for genre is usefully "intertextual"; categories of text are relational in the sense that they give a description of a form that shows how it differs from other forms, suggesting that genre shows what a text is not, as much as what it is (McCracken, 1998). The comparative search for genres may also be historical, drawing on texts from different eras, without implying historical relativism. As in biological taxonomies, historical variation does not preclude empirically justifiable classification.

The "Objectivity" of Genre

In attempts to articulate empirically justifiable categories of fiction, it may be a mistake to rely solely upon expert judgments of the narrative or stylistic features of the text. Even when literary specialists articulate reliably judged features of polythetically conceived genre, they may unwittingly select features that are not relevant to some—or

even the majority of—non-expert readers. The difficulty is not simply that there are conflicting norms for what aspects of the text warrant the reader's attention or that non-experts may offer interpretations of the text that are as viable as the expert's. Rather, the risk is that genre definitions may become dissociated from the reading activities of actual readers—either expert or non-expert. In fact, there are compelling reasons to consider actual readers' engagement with the text as critical to genre identification.

First, it is evident that non-expert readers, who often read outside of the academy and away from the purview of literary specialists, may develop their own conventions for the classification of texts. Not only may commercial authorities (e.g., Chapters; Amazon) informally shape those conventions, but educational and private reading experiences may also nurture an informal understanding of genres. Genres are conceptions that extend into everyday life, and as Chandler (1997) points out, "even if theorists were to abandon the concept, in everyday life people would continue to categorize text."

Second, it may be valuable to characterize genres in relation to readers' actual engagement with the text, especially in relation to the specific aspects of the reading process. This task may require more than the traditional conception of how specific stylistic or narrative features function for an implied or an ideal reader; it may also require more than consideration of how the reader informally categorizes text. Instead, it may require concrete examination of—and categorization of—the complex and temporally unfolding interaction between features of the text and the reader's orientation toward them.

Reading Orientations and Conceptions of Genre

The determination of genre for readers (expert and non-expert alike) takes place throughout the reading event, from initial text selection to reading outcomes, as part of a mutually influencing, temporally unfolding process. Although both the text and the reader are involved, genre, we suggest, exists in the ongoing interaction between reader expectations and the reader's immediate, conventional response to text structure. A text may guide the reader in one direction but the reader may linger elsewhere. A reader may come to a text with particular expectations and find resistance to those expectations within her own immediate response to the text. Reader expectations may even make it possible to read a text "against" its structure in an oppositional manner, such as when romance is read as comedy or comedy as drama.

Genre, then, "emerges from the specific and located interaction" that occurs between reader expectations and the reader's response to the text (Livingstone, 1994). Although often described as "negotiation" of a "contract," such a portrayal betrays the aesthetic, non-contractual outcomes through which the text becomes memorable for the reader. Therefore, the present study focuses on the relationship between reader and reader response to the text, that is, on the evolution of the reader's mode of "attunement" to the world of the text.

Modes of attunement emerge and fade over time within a reading event. The initial moment when text and reader meet begins a temporally unfolding interaction through which the reader's attunement to the world of the text is progressively altered. As the reader engages more of the text—or engages it repeatedly—the expectation of what

will occur next is constantly adjusted. The fluctuation of confirmed and disconfirmed expectations, the continuing movement between reader expectation and reactions to text structure, can be mapped as a sequence of changes in modes of attunement. When reading is finished, there is usually a final and reflexive consolidation of the reader's understanding of this progression in her attunement to the world of the text and how that progression in attunement is related to the world beyond the text. Such reflexive consolidation of the reader's self-understood orientation is an outcome of the reading process that the reader takes away from the reading activity for later reference and use. The reader's orientation toward the text is not only a culminating impression of the reading experience; it is also a set of expectations with which to return to the everyday world. This reflexive articulation of the relations between the reading experience and the world beyond the text is the final step in the reader's conceptualization of "books of this type." The combination of experiences surrounding the act of reading—expectations, reading engagement, and reading outcome—together forms the self-understood reader orientation that provides a novel ground for the study of genre.

We propose that, during this culminating moment in the reading event, those aspects of reading experience that are memorable guide readers' articulation of their orientation. For some, what is memorable is concerned with those aspects of the reading event that are pleasurable, enjoyable, or entertaining; for others what is memorable is concerned with what is interesting, striking, or evocative. Regardless of whether readers conceive themselves as "pleasurably" or "strikingly" attuned, the problem of genre ultimately revolves around what makes the reader's orientation toward the text

memorable. More concretely, the problem of genre can be reframed as an empirical quest for a polythetic taxonomy of reading orientations, i.e., of *memorable progressions in readers' attunement to the world of the text, including the culmination of such progressions in the reflexive articulation of the relations between the reading experience and the world beyond the text.*

Empirical Study of Genre

The conception of genre presented here is largely theoretical, and it is important to ground this conception in the reading activities and reflections of real readers. Research to date is based upon conventionally designated genre, often supported by commercial authorities or experts, rather than relying upon specific and concrete accounts of readers' orientations within the reading event. For example, in a study of German popular fiction, readers were asked about their reasons for reading popular fiction (e.g., science fiction, romance fiction), relying upon the respondents' understanding of this conventional genre (Barsch, 1997). The authors concluded that, to grasp readers' understanding (their "cognitive elaborations") of a conventional genre such as "popular fiction," it is necessary to look beyond features of the text per se and to consider also the reader's interests and motives. Although their concluding conceptualization of the problem suggests a concern with reader orientation as defined here, their empirical effort, including the items on their questionnaire, addressed why readers read "popular fiction." They did not concretely examine readers' attunement to the text or their reflexively considered orientation toward the text as a multifaceted reading event.

In another empirical approach, this time concerning romance readers, Radway (1984) examined readers' cultural competencies, i.e., their learned way of taking up a text and using it to produce meaning. Although her conception of cultural competencies resembles the conception of reading orientation adopted here, her concrete observations were concerned less with how readers take up the text than with the meaning-producing relations between reading activity and the world beyond the text. Hers was "less an account of the way romances as texts were interpreted [within the act of reading] than of the way romance reading as a form of behavior operated...in the ongoing social life of...social subjects" (Radway, 1984, p. 7). Although useful for its cultural account of the consequences of romance reading, Radway (1984) did not closely examine the modes of attunement at the site of the reader's encounter with the text. To that extent, it remains only a partial explication of the type of reader orientation with which she was most concerned.

Dixon and Bortolussi (2003) came closest to the present conception of genre in their study of the semantic similarities between essays in which readers described their understanding of several popular narrative genres (i.e., romance, fantasy, and science fiction). Their polythetic taxonomic procedures (involving Latent Structure Analysis; Lazarsfeld & Henry, 1968) allowed the identification of some classes of essays that converged with conventional genre classification and other classes of essays that were independent of these conventional genre classifications. Although their results underline the importance of consulting real readers in the classification of reading events, they did

not concretely examine reader attunement and the culminating articulation of reader orientation toward the text in particular (not already classified) reading events.

Current Study

The current study extends beyond conventional, non-expert-designated, and expert-designated genre to examine reader conception of genre in terms of readers' orientation toward fictional texts. By concretely exploring how readers engage particular fictional texts, this study investigates the ways in which readers form an understanding of the texts they encounter, including the ways in which they articulate their understanding of the relations between the world of the text and the world beyond it. As such, the present study is an initial empirical examination of genre understood as types of reader orientation. In the first part of the study, readers were asked to describe their orientations within particular reading events, allowing for the identification of polythetic classes of reading orientations. The second part explored the relations between reading orientations, non-expert-designated texts, and expert-designated texts. We also examined whether the reading orientations identified were associated with distinctive reading outcomes.

Methods

Participants

Participants were 163 undergraduate introductory psychology and English literature students at the University of Alberta (101 females and 62 males, mean age = 20.3 years). The sample was divided among nine ethnic groups with 6 participants identifying themselves as Aboriginal, 1 as African, 35 as East Asian, 11 as South Asian, 32 as European, 1 as Latin-American, 59 as Euro-North American, 3 as Pacific Islander,

and 12 as Other (missing data excluded for 3 participants). One hundred and nineteen psychology students were offered partial course credit for their participation. Forty-four English students participated as volunteers and were not offered any remuneration. Participants completed the materials in groups of 10-20.

Procedure

Participants completed a two-part questionnaire that asked about their experience of reading fiction (see Appendix A for Reading Fiction: A Questionnaire, Part I and Part II). They were told that the study concerned their experience of reading fiction and were given 50 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Upon completion, they were given a complete debriefing.

Materials

Part I. The first part of the questionnaire began with instructions to "list the titles (and, if possible, the authors) of up to four fictional texts that you remember reading during the last year." Participants then rated the extent to which each of 24 potential reasons for reading fiction described their own rationale, using a five-point scale to give responses ranging from 0 (*not at all true*) to 4 (*extremely true*). The list of 24 reasons was presented once for each text (i.e., a total of four times). These items were the means by which we assessed the reader's orientation within each of these four reading events in the present study.

The list of reasons can be grouped thematically, in groups that reflect patterns of association established in prior studies and in the present one. However, the groupings

presented here are for ease of presentation only, and neither fixed by prior research nor straightforwardly reflective of the results in the present study.

One of these themes describes a concern with entertainment and diversion, as indicated in reasons for reading such as "to enjoy the excitement and suspense", "because I wanted to be entertained" and "to relax." Another theme involves reading for educational or intellectual benefit, indicated in reasons for reading such as "it was important for my education", "because I expected to be challenged intellectually" and "to compare this text with others texts by the same or different authors." A third set of questions reflects a concern with personal awareness and development, as seen in reasons for reading such as "to gain insight into my own thoughts, feelings, and actions", "to consider other ways that I might lead my own life" and "to think about personal problems." Another theme involves reading to gain insight into the external world and others, as indicated in reasons for reading such as "to get new ideas about things that might actually happen", "to gain insight into others' thoughts, feelings, and actions" and "to improve my understanding of what really happens in the world." Finally, one set of reasons has to do with imaginative involvement in the world of the text, as indicated in reasons for reading such as "to be captivated by the events in a story", "to get away from my everyday problems and concerns," and "because it had nothing to do with everyday reality."

Next, the questionnaire asked participants to select the one text label, from an array of 15, that best described each of their four texts. The labels provided were: comics, romances, fantasy, short stories, fairy tales, literary novels, fictional diaries, westerns,

crime novels, hyperfiction, poetry, historical novels, science fiction, dramas, and "other." Participant designation of text labels will be referred to as non-expert-designated text from this point on.

Finally, participants were asked to write, in their own words, the reasons for their label selections.

Part II. In the second part of the questionnaire, participants were asked to list the fictional genre that they read most frequently and the fictional genre that they read next most frequently, using the same text labels introduced in Part I of the questionnaire. Then, for each text type selected, they answered a series of questions about (1) their concrete reading activities, (2) the hedonic (e.g., pleasure), affective (e.g., warmth), and epistemic (e.g., interest) tone of their attunement to the text, and (3) their concluding impression of the relation between their understanding of the text and the world beyond the text. For the questions about reading activities, for example, readers were asked to indicate using a five-point scale, how often they read a particular text type (ratings ranged from 0 [*rarely*] to 4 [*all the time*]), how long (on average) each instance of reading lasted (ratings ranged from 0 [*15 minutes or less*] to 4 [*over 2 hours*]), and how often they discussed that kind of text with others (ratings ranged from 0 [*rarely or never*] to 4 [*extremely often*]). The questions about the tone of their attunement included bipolar items probing pleasure, warmth, interest, complexity, emotionality, meaningfulness, and familiarity, along a five-point scale that ranged from 0 (complete lack of a perception) to 4 (full presence of a perception). The questions about their concluding impressions addressed several different domains: (1) shifts in personal awareness (e.g., "I became

sensitive to aspects of my life that I usually ignore"), (2) identity change (e.g., "I felt like a somewhat different person for hours, or even days, afterwards"), (3) insight into others or the world at large (e.g., "I learned about other cultures"), and (4) escape from others or the world at large (e.g., "I was able to escape into a different world"). These questions required ratings on a five-point rating scale, with responses ranging from 0 (*not at all true*) to 4 (*extremely true*).

Following completion of the questionnaire materials by study participants, a literary expert (a doctoral student in English Literature at the University of Alberta) reviewed the texts listed by participants and using the same array of 15 text labels provided in the questionnaire, selected the one that best described each of the texts. Expert selection of genre labels is referred to as expert-designated text for the purposes of this study.

Results

Identifying Types of Reading Orientation

Reading orientations were assessed using responses to the 24 reasons for reading each of the four texts selected by participants in Part I of the questionnaire. Responses for each listed text were considered a separate unit of analysis; with 163 readers, this provided a total of 554 responses, missing data excluded. Cluster analysis of the responses using squared Euclidean distance coefficients, Wards Method, produced six classes of reading orientation (Cluster I, n=96; Cluster II, n=79; Cluster III, n=118; Cluster IV, n=138; Cluster V, n=54, Cluster VI, n=69). The items differentiating these clusters of reading orientation were assessed using one-way ANOVAs as a guide to

clarify which items were more-or-less characteristic of each cluster. It should be noted that these ANOVAs are not intended as tests of significance, but rather as a guideline for establishing the characteristics of a cluster. Fisher's LSD tests of *post hoc* comparison ($p < .05$) provided a criterion for determining which responses were characteristic of any given cluster. In order for an item to be considered characteristic of a cluster, it had to differentiate its cluster (as higher) from at least three of the other five. The characteristic items making up each cluster are presented in Table 1 and discussed in the following sections.

Table 1
Reading Orientation Clusters

	Cluster					
Reading Item	I Ludic	II Ludic Explore	III Education	IV Education Explore	V Epistemic	VI Moderate
1. To relax	3.26**	3.43**	0.45	1.34	2.85*	2.08
2. To enjoy excitement and suspense	3.43**	3.54**	0.33	1.69	2.88*	2.02
6. Be captivated by events in a story	3.41*	3.82**	0.57	2.02	3.31*	2.39
7. To be entertained	3.72**	3.79**	0.51	1.93	3.22*	2.15
10. Get away from problems	2.27**	2.43**	0.37	1.26	2.53**	1.10
12. Could vividly imagine situations	2.72*	3.51**	0.40	1.98	3.25**	1.94
14. Use my imagination	3.13*	3.46**	0.40	2.11	2.90*	1.69
18. Had nothing to do with reality	2.26**	2.31**	0.34	1.19	1.09	1.05
24. Vivid description of people, events	2.65*	3.37**	0.44	2.06	3.53**	1.89
3. To think about personal problems	0.18	0.58	0.08	0.97*	2.46**	0.98*
5. Gain insight into my own thoughts	0.51	1.77*	0.24	1.60*	3.12**	1.53*
11. Could identify with characters	0.89	1.84*	0.13	1.21	3.03**	1.27
17. Further my personal development	0.32	1.87*	0.32	1.86*	3.50**	1.91*
21. Consider ways to lead my life	0.20	0.94*	0.21	0.91*	2.68**	1.13*
4. Important for my education	0.19	0.72	3.02*	3.60**	2.90*	1.05
23. Required reading in a course	0.19	0.20	3.54*	3.81**	2.01	0.33
8. New ideas about things	0.76	1.60*	0.26	1.25	3.22**	1.71*
9. Insight into others' feelings, action	0.71	2.35*	0.33	1.97	3.40**	1.86
16. Understanding of world	0.32	1.26	0.33	1.59*	3.27**	1.68*
20. Be challenged intellectually	0.85	2.02*	0.55	2.24*	3.14**	1.75
13. Language style	1.55	2.30*	0.20	1.52	2.83**	1.75
15. Learn about author's perspective	0.38	1.93	0.77	2.28*	3.20**	2.00*
19. Talk about text with others	0.96	2.07*	0.68	2.42*	2.87**	1.27
22. Compare this text with other texts	1.14	1.58*	0.59	1.88*	2.42**	1.05

** = The largest mean (or any mean that is no smaller than the largest) that also differs from at least three others using the LSD $p<.05$ criterion

* = A mean smaller than the largest that differs from at least two others using the LSD $p<.05$ criterion

Cluster I: Ludic Reading (n = 96). Cluster I is a reading orientation concentrated on play and pleasure. It emphasizes the importance of entertainment, diversion, and relaxation (e.g., "enjoy excitement and suspense"; "get away from my everyday problems"), and involves a form of reading that captivates the reader, and stimulates the imagination (e.g., "use my imagination"; "be captivated"). The exclusive focus on entertainment and pleasure in this group characterizes a pure form of ludic reading.

Reading in this cluster was not characterized by reading for insight into oneself or others (self- and other-oriented reasons for reading such as to "further my personal development" or "improve understanding of what really happens in the world" were not characteristic of this cluster). Reading was also not characterized by interest in textual features or the author's concerns, or by engagement in comparative activity in relation to the text. Furthermore, educational obligations as reasons for reading were not typical of this group.

Rather than any of the preceding reasons, the primary motivation for reading in Cluster I was for diversionary play and pleasure.

Associated Genre: Popular Fiction. Using Chi Squared statistics, each cluster—that is, each reading orientation—was assessed for agreement with non-expert-designated text labels. As indicated in Table 2 (see Appendix B for complete table, including all non-expert-designated text types), the Ludic Reading cluster corresponded to non-expert-designated fantasy texts, χ^2 (1, N = 537) = 22.3, $p < .05$, with 26 out of a possible 94 matches. Each reading orientation was also assessed for agreement with expert-designated text, as a means of comparison to non-expert designation. As shown in Table

3 (see Appendix B for complete table including all expert-designated text types), the Ludic Reading cluster corresponded to expert-designated (1) fantasy texts, χ^2 (1, N = 531) = 57.6, $p < .05$, with 34 out of a possible 91 matches and (2) crime novels, χ^2 (1, N = 531) = 33.3, $p < .05$, with 16 out of a possible 91 matches. Although this finding followed the pattern indicated in the case of non-expert-designated texts, expert-designated text's correspondence to Ludic Reading extended to crime novels.

Table 2
Reading Orientation Agreement with Non-Expert-Designated Text Labels

Reading Orientation		Non-Expert-Designated Text					
		Fantasy	Short	Literary	Crime	Historic	Drama
Ludic	Observed	26*	2	2	14	1	6
	Expected	12.1	7.9	22.2	4	9.1	8.9
Ludic Exploratory	Observed	26*	3	13	6	5	5
	Expected	10.2	6.6	18.7	3.4	7.6	7.5
Educational	Observed	3	14	40*	0	12	14
	Expected	14.9	9.7	27.4	5	11.2	11
Educational Exploratory	Observed	5	18*	48*	0	21*	11
	Expected	17.5	11.4	32.2	5.8	13.2	12.9
Epistemic	Observed	3	5	12	0	8	9
	Expected	6.2	4	11.4	2.1	4.6	4.6
Moderate	Observed	6	3	12	3	5	6
	Expected	8.2	5.4	15.1	2.7	6.2	6.1
Total	Observed	69	45	127	23	52	51
	Expected	69	45	127	23	52	51

* = $p < .05$

Table 3
Reading Orientation Agreement with Expert-Designated Text Labels

Reading Orientation		Expert-Designated Text					
		Fantasy	Short	Literary	Crime	Historic	Drama
Ludic	Observed	34*	2	10	16*	1	1
	Expected	11.8	6.7	45.9	4.8	.7	6.3
Ludic Exploratory	Observed	22*	1	20	7	2	1
	Expected	9.9	5.6	38.4	4	.6	5.3
Educational	Observed	1	12	85*	0	0	13*
	Expected	15.2	8.6	59.1	6.2	.9	8.2
Educational Exploratory	Observed	2	12	97*	1	0	18*
	Expected	17.7	10.1	69.1	7.2	1	9.5
Epistemic	Observed	4	7	31	0	0	3
	Expected	6.4	3.6	24.7	2.6	.4	3.4
Moderate	Observed	6	5	25	4	1	1
	Expected	7.9	4.5	30.8	3.2	.5	4.3
Total	Observed	69	39	268	28	4	37
	Expected	69	39	268	28	4	37

* = $p < .05$

Cluster II: Ludic with Intellectual Exploration (n = 79). Cluster II is a reading orientation that includes play and pleasure in combination with intellectual exploration. Reading in this cluster is done for the sake of entertainment, diversion, and captivation (e.g., "enjoy excitement and suspense"; "use my imagination"; "be captivated by the events in a story") in a way that eludes everyday reality (e.g., "get away from my everyday problems

and concerns ") and invokes powerful imagery (e.g., "could vividly imagine the situations described").

Although entertainment-driven, this reading orientation also included a self-oriented sense of awareness (e.g., "gain insight into my own thoughts, feelings, and actions"; "consider other ways that I might lead my own life") that was related to fictional characters (e.g., "could identify with the characters") but not necessarily preoccupied with personal problems ("think about personal problems" was not characteristic of this cluster). Reading was also concerned with gaining an understanding of others (e.g., "gain insight into others' thoughts, feelings, and actions") but not of the everyday world ("improve understanding of what really happens in the world" was not characteristic of this cluster).

While reading in this group was not associated with formal educational requirements, it did involve intellectual curiosity and a sense of novelty (e.g., "get new ideas"; "be challenged intellectually"). Reading in this orientation was also concerned with language style and was carried out in a comparative spirit, both inter-textually (e.g., "compare this text with other texts") and socially (e.g., "wanted to talk about this text with others").

Unlike the pure ludic orientation of Cluster I, this group's ludic interests occurred in combination with intellectual exploration.

Associated Genre: Popular Fiction. As did Cluster I, Cluster II corresponded to non-expert-designated fantasy texts, χ^2 (1, N = 537) = 33.2, $p < .05$, with 26 out of a possible 79 matches, the same number of fantasy texts that were associated with Cluster I. The

Intellectual Ludic cluster did not otherwise correspond significantly to any other non-expert-designated text category. Also, comparable to Cluster I, Cluster II corresponded to expert-designated fantasy texts, χ^2 (1, N = 531) = 19.9, $p < .05$, with 22 out of a possible 76 matches.

Cluster III: Educational Reading (n = 118). Cluster III is an orientation in which reading is a compulsory task done mainly for instrumental purposes. This was indicated in the two items with the highest ratings for this group: reading for educational purposes (e.g., "important for my education") and because a text is required reading (e.g., "required reading in a course"). No further reasons for reading were characteristic of this orientation. With an exclusive focus on educational obligation, this group represents a pure form of educational reading, much like Cluster I above is indicative of pure ludic reading.

Associated Genre: Literary Fiction. Cluster III corresponded to non-expert-designated literary fiction texts, χ^2 (1, N = 537) = 9.6, $p < .05$, with 40 out of a possible 116 matches. Also, Cluster III corresponded to expert-designated (1) literary fiction texts, χ^2 (1, N = 531) = 29.5, $p < .05$, with 85 out of a possible 117 matches, as well as (2) drama texts, χ^2 (1, N = 531) = 3.9, $p < .05$, with 13 out of a possible 117 matches.

Cluster IV: Educational Reading with Intellectual Exploration (n = 138). For Cluster IV, reading is an educational pursuit that also provides intellectual challenge. Instead of providing entertainment, diversion, or imaginary captivation, reading has an obligatory, requisite sense (e.g., "important for my education" and "required reading" were rated most highly in this group).

But, beyond its educational orientation (also characteristic of Cluster III), this cluster also included epistemic exploration. Reading was done to gain a sense of self-oriented understanding (e.g., "insight into my own thoughts, feelings, and actions"; "further my personal development"; "think about personal problems"). It also carried an interest in understanding the external world (e.g., "understanding of what really happens in the world"), although this other-oriented interest did not extend to fictional characters ("identify with the characters" was not characteristic of this cluster), or to other people (reading to "gain insight into others' thoughts, feelings and actions" was also not characteristic).

Intellectual exploration for this group may be based on the seeking out of fixed knowledge rather than inspiring novel thought ("be challenged intellectually" was characteristic of this cluster whereas "get new ideas about things" was not). Perhaps in keeping with an educational motivation, this reading orientation carried an interest in the author's concerns and engagement in comparative behavior (e.g., "talk about this text with others" and "compare this text with other texts").

Just as ludic reading took pure and intellectual exploration forms, it appears that in a parallel manner, educational reading also appears in pure and intellectual exploration forms.

Associated Genre: Literary Fiction. Cluster IV was associated with two non-expert-designated literary fiction categories. It corresponded to non-expert-designated (1) short story texts, χ^2 (1, N = 537) = 5.5, $p < .05$, with 18 out of a possible 136 matches and (2) literary texts, χ^2 (1, N = 537) = 13.6, $p < .05$, with 48 out of a possible 136 matches. In

addition, this cluster corresponded to non-expert-designated historical fiction texts, a conventional fiction category that may be classified as literary, χ^2 (1, N = 537) = 6.9, $p <$ .05, with 21 out of a possible 136 matches.

Similarly, Cluster IV was associated with expert-designated (1) literary texts, χ^2 (1, N = 531) = 30.5, $p < .05$, with 97 out of a possible 137 matches and (2) drama texts, χ^2 (1, N = 531) = 10.8, $p < .05$, with 18 out of a possible 137 matches.

Cluster V: Epistemic Reading (n = 54). Cluster V is a reading orientation with broad epistemic interests. Reading was motivated by a wide variety of factors, which characterized this orientation as a kind of "do everything" group. Reading was done in a way that captured the reader's imagination (e.g., "could vividly imagine the situations"), entertained and distracted (e.g., "enjoy excitement and suspense"), and allowed for escape from everyday life (e.g., "get away from my everyday problems") but not in a way that was entirely removed from life ("had nothing to do with everyday reality" was not characteristic of this cluster). Reading also recognized the importance of education perhaps for its own sake (e.g., "important for my education") rather than because it was a compulsory obligation ("required reading in a course" was not characteristic of this group).

Reasons for reading that had to do with intellectual exploration and self- and other-oriented insight were all distinctly represented in this cluster. That is, all reasons relating to these themes were rated more highly in this cluster than all others. Reading was done to gain self-awareness (e.g., "gain insight into my own thoughts, feelings, and actions"), in this case, in a way that related to fictional characters and furthered personal

development. Reading in this cluster was also done in an other-oriented sense, for insight into the world and others (e.g., "get new ideas"; "gain insight into others' thoughts, feelings, and actions"; "improve understanding of what really happens in the world"). These interests extended to textual elements including language and the author's perspective, as well as comparison with other texts and readers' impressions.

In sum, this cluster was defined by an overarching sense of intellectual and epistemic engagement.

Associated Genre: None. The epistemic reading orientation did not correspond significantly to any non-expert-designated text category. In particular, it was not significantly represented in the literary text category, a text type that may typically be associated with epistemic exploration. These findings extended to expert-designated texts, none of which corresponded significantly to Cluster V.

Cluster VI: Moderately Engaged Reading (n = 69). Cluster VI is a cluster that had moderate ratings on most of the reasons given for reading. The items that were characteristic of this group concerned aspects of self-oriented awareness (e.g., "gain insight into my own thoughts, feelings, and actions") including personal development (e.g., "consider other ways that I might lead my own life"; "further my personal development"), as well as an other-oriented understanding of external surroundings and events (e.g., "get new ideas about things that might actually happen"; "improve understanding of what really happens in the world") although this did not include seeking understanding of others ("insight into others' thoughts, feelings, and actions" and "identify with the characters" were not characteristic of this cluster). Cluster VI was also

moderately concerned with investigation of the author's perspective in addition to concerns with self-awareness and the external world.

This cluster is largely defined by a modest endorsement of some of the possible reasons given for reading.

Associated Genre: None. Cluster VI did not correspond to any non-expert- or expert-designated fictional texts.

Identifying Reader Types

Reading orientation was used to classify readers according to their manner of reading. Cluster analysis (Squared Euclidean distances, Wards Method) was conducted on the frequency with which each reading orientation was reported across the four texts listed by each person. This served to identify groups of readers more or less distinctively associated with each of the previously identified six reading orientations (Cluster 1, Ludic Reading, n=37; Cluster 2, Ludic with Intellectual Exploration, n=39; Cluster 3, Educational Reading, n=23; Cluster 4, Educational Reading with Intellectual Exploration, n=12; Cluster 5, Epistemic Reading, n=18; Cluster 6, Moderate Reading, n=34). The six-cluster solution for reader types was selected primarily because it corresponded to the reading orientation clusters from the first part of the study. This decision was made for conceptual reasons that emphasized congruity between reading orientations and reader types.

Forms of Reading Engagement

A reading memorability scale was created by averaging three items assessing the frequency of (1) reading, (2) reading-related discussion, and (3) reading-related activities,

where high ratings suggest that the reader turns to these activities with greater frequency. The item assessing frequency of reading asked participants to detail how often they read texts from their most read category, on a scale ranging from "rarely" to "all the time." Frequency of reading-related discussion asked how often readers discussed what they read with others, on a scale ranging from "rarely or never" to "extremely often." Frequency of reading-related activities asked participants to indicate whether they took part in any activities related to the reading of texts in their most read category, on a scale ranging from "rarely or never" to "extremely often." To examine internal consistency for this reader-engagement index, Cronbach's Alpha was calculated, yielding a value of .45. Such low reliability suggests that these measures of reading and reading-related activity do not obviously occur together or hold the same meaning for readers. As such, any further measurement of reading engagement should consider other, separate items for inclusion in this scale.

Given that novel forms of ludic and educational reading were found in this study, greater attention was given to the exploratory reader types in order to articulate the makeup of these readers. Considering conventional associations with ludic and educational reading as purely entertaining or obligatory, it was significant that these kinds of reading occurred in exploratory forms. In light of the exploratory nature of the current study and its accompanying analysis, the selection of results reported here are those that are expected to be fruitful for future research. To this end, the exploratory groups with their array of intellectual interests and potential reading-derived activities proved to be of greatest interest.

Ludic exploratory readers and educational exploratory readers were associated with contrasting forms of reading engagement. As shown in Table 4, for ludic exploratory readers, reading engagement for their most read type of text was predicted by a sense of insight into people and events ($r = .34$, $p < .05$). For educational exploratory readers, reading engagement in the case of their most read text type was predicted by items that described greater self-understanding, including becoming sensitive to aspects of life usually ignored ($r = .73$, $p < .05$), being reminded of deeply held values ($r = .74$, $p < .01$) and feeling like a different person ($r = .78$, $p < .01$). In sum, while reading engagement was characterized by greater self-understanding for the educational exploratory readers, it was characterized by better understanding of others for the ludic exploratory readers.

Table 4
Correlates of Reading Engagement for Ludic Exploratory and Educational Exploratory Groups

	Reader Groups	
Reading Outcome	Ludic Exploratory	Educational Exploratory
I became sensitive to aspects of my life that I usually ignore	.121	.726*
I began to feel like changing the way I live	.066	.781*
My mood was changed for hours, or even days afterwards	-.036	.638*
I was reminded of some of my most deeply held values	.190	.739*
I felt like a somewhat different person	-.177	.778*
I began to reconsider some events in my past	.206	.533
I learned about other cultures	.152	.516
I was able to escape into a different world	-.306	.496
I gained insight into people and events in my world	.344*	.692*

* = $p < .05$

Although self- and other-oriented forms of insight mediated reading engagement across educational exploratory and ludic exploratory readers, respectively, there is evidence that, during the reading experience itself (in contrast to the post-reading activities that define reading engagement), reading for insight into others was associated with self-perceptual depth in both groups. That is, for educational exploratory readers, self-perceptual depth (i.e., a four-item scale reflecting increased sensitivity, readiness to change, changed mood, and reconsideration of past events) in the case of their most read text type was associated with a sense of "insight into people and events" ($r = .87$, $p < .01$). Correspondingly, for ludic exploratory readers, self-perceptual depth in the case of their most read text type was also associated with a sense of "insight into people and events" ($r = .55$, $p < .01$).

Associations Between Reader Types and Text Types

Using Chi Squared statistics, each person cluster was examined for correspondence with the fictional genres read most frequently and next most frequently, as reported in the second part of the questionnaire. These text types were grouped into popular fiction (comics, romances, fantasy, fairy tales, fictional diaries, westerns, crime novels, science fiction) and literary fiction (short stories, literary novels, poetry, historical novels). An examination of agreement found no reliable correspondence between reader type and popular or literary text types. That is, readers read both types of text about equally often, suggesting that whatever text types readers choose to read, they do so from within the reading orientation that they indicate most frequently. For example, a reader

distinctively associated with the ludic reading orientation may read both popular and literary texts from within a ludic orientation.

Influence of Text Type

We examined reading outcomes of the text types that readers indicated as reading most often and next most often in Part II of the Reading Questionnaire. In separate analyses of readers who frequently read popular fiction (indicated reading popular fiction most often) and readers who frequently read literary fiction (indicated reading literary fiction most often), there was evidence of two different forms of reading influence across these non-expert-designated text types. For literary fiction readers, self-perceptual depth (i.e., increased sensitivity, readiness to change, changed mood, and reconsideration of past events) was associated with using fiction to "escape into a different world" ($r = .416$, $p < .01$). In contrast, for popular fiction readers, self-perceptual depth was associated with using fiction to "learn about other cultures" ($r = .53$, $p < .01$).

Discussion

This study demonstrates that types of reading orientation can be identified within particular reading events, and described as meaningful differences in how readers engage a variety of texts. Educational and ludic orientations in particular were found to have variant forms that could be differentiated on the basis of intellectual exploration that occurs during reading.

Evaluating the Reading Orientation Approach

In general, results indicate that the reading orientation approach to genre is effective in its re-characterization of genre as based in the reading activities of real

readers. A reading oriented strategy enables the articulation of finer differences between educational forms of reading and ludic forms of reading than may be typically observed in a textual feature approach to genre, because the examination of genre premised on differences between text types does not provide insight into the interaction between reader expectation and reaction during reading. The identification of qualitatively different reading orientations pulls apart types of reading that occur in educational (pure educational and educational with exploration) and ludic (pure ludic and ludic with exploration) forms, and avoids the oversimplification of a text-based examination of genre that characterizes readers only on the basis of the text categories with which they are associated. Calling on reader engagement makes possible a fresh understanding of genre than would be evident if the questions asked were restricted to the features of a text.

The presentation of alternate forms of educational and ludic reading is itself informative of how fictional texts are "read." While it may be possible to predict on the basis of anecdotal experience that books are read variously for the purposes of pleasure or obligation, the specific educational and ludic forms—in this case, two of each—are apparent only after consultation with readers themselves. The psychology and English student readers in this study have indicated that reading can occur in a number of forms that are not entirely expected.

Educational reading can be pursued quite literally for the purposes of meeting educational obligations and nothing else. Readers indicated in the reading questionnaire that they might read strictly out of duty, and without any further motivation or outcome.

However, this kind of reading can also occur in a form that incorporates the requirements imposed by an educational institution into epistemic activity that appears to be carried on for the sake of personal enrichment. Similarly, ludic reading also appears in a form purely for the purposes of distraction and pleasure, only to reappear in a variety that integrates pleasurable reading into a more epistemically layered pursuit that includes contemplative exploration. Such findings belie the easy prediction that reading is done in uncomplicated ways in relation to specific text types. In fact, as the results of this study show, reading orientations are differentiated in fine-drawn ways, and associated with types of reader and reader-designated text in different ways.

A reading oriented approach to genre was also effective in its identification of orientations that were both interpretable and novel. The majority of the clusters identified were coherent in their characterizations of reading, and in the cases that distinguished among educational and ludic readers, especially meaningful. However, cluster coherence cannot be taken for granted, as indicated by the Moderately Engaged reading orientation, which showed moderate ratings on most reasons given for reading and was not obviously characteristic of a discrete reading experience. This group may represent a methodological artifact of "indifferent" responding, given that moderate or "lukewarm" responses were especially characteristic of this cluster. Yet, this may not mean that the findings for this cluster were meaningless. The presence of such an indistinct group in combination with other, well-defined clusters raises the possibility of a continuum of reading experience that runs between radical and indifferent forms of reading. As with any activity, it may be that in some cases, reading is more enthusiastically regarded than

in others, whether it is done in an educational spirit or a ludic one. Thus, even when reading is described as an experience of educational drudgery, the experience may be powerfully articulated. It may be that when reading is considered with indifference no strongly defined characteristics describe the reading experience.

The more distinct clusters can be understood as fine-grained characterizations of how readers articulate their experience of engaging a text, and as such these reading orientations provide insight into reading that may not be anticipated in a traditional generic approach. For example, the Ludic with Intellectual Exploration orientation and its association with expert and non-expert designated popular fiction may be used to help illustrate the reading experience of someone reading self-designated fantasy (e.g., The Lord of the Rings; Tolkien, 1954). This may be a reader who reads for captivation and excitement (imagined in the epic adventures of a hobbit hero engaged in a series of struggles and battles), and who through vivid experience of the text gains a greater sense of personal awareness (e.g., considering her relationships in light of the bond between Frodo and Sam) and engages intellectually with both the text and others (e.g., re-working the concept of a conflict between good and evil in discussion with other readers, and in relation to other textual accounts). At the end of her reading experience, the reader may have an increased sense of self-perceptual depth that occurs through a feeling of insight into other cultures (e.g., reconsidering her place in a multicultural world in view of the various races in Middle-Earth, and their interrelations).

Reading Orientations and Reader-Designated Text Types

An examination of the relations between reading orientations and expert and non-expert text classifications revealed that educational orientations were associated with forms of literary fiction, and ludic orientations were associated with forms of popular fiction. Reading events associated with reader-designated literary texts had an educational quality with connotations of obligation and schoolwork. Likewise, reading events associated with texts classified as popular had a ludic quality that carried connotations of diversionary pleasure.

The results demonstrate that there is more than a single way to engage with a reader-designated text type, and in doing so readers articulate some differences among the forms of reading associated with particular texts. Literary texts may be linked to reading events characterized solely as educational obligations, but they are also associated with reading in a way that is both educationally motivated and intellectually rewarding. In the same way, the reading of popular fiction can exclusively involve pleasurable immersion as well as pleasure in combination with intellectual reflection. Popular and literary fiction can be broadly characterized according to ludic and educational reading orientations, but they can also be differentiated within those orientations.

The nature of the reading events associated with literary and popular fiction is indicative of the culminating interaction between the reader's expectations and immediate reaction to the text more than it may be revealing of text or reader types themselves. Reading events constitute the entirety of a reading experience, as expressed in the

interaction between reader expectations and the immediate, conventional response to text structure, rather than any one factor, including either textual features or reader characteristics. It therefore is not possible to draw causal conclusions in any direction, either in the sense that reader or text types elicit particular kinds of reading activity or that particular reading orientations determine the classification of reader or text. Reading orientations comprise an ongoing series of interactions that structure and re-structure the way that a text is read. For example, the experience of reading literary texts may involve an amalgamation of factors that position the reader in relation to a text before (e.g., in a classroom setting, through past experience), during (e.g., immediate reaction to text, adjusted expectations), and after (e.g., intertextual comparison, personal accommodation, classroom activity) the reading experience.

Reader Orientations and Reader-Designated Text Types

The association between reading orientation and reader-designated texts did not extend to the relationship between reader types and reader-designated texts, where there was no clear connection found. The absence of any relationship between literary or popular fiction and reader orientations was indication that there is not a fixed frame of reference from which to read any particular type of text. Rather than focus on one primary text type, readers engage with a variety of texts, although with differential frequency, indicating that they were reading a mixture of text types. When the text labels employed by readers were grouped into broad categories of literary and popular fiction, the correspondence of text type (as designated by readers) to reader (as characterized by a reading orientation) did not reproduce the associations found for text types with reading

orientations, where literary fiction corresponded to educational orientations and popular fiction to ludic orientations.

It may be that different text types can be read from within particular reader orientations rather than orientations being defined by types of text. In view of this, a ludic reader may approach fantasy, literature or science fiction from within an orientation of playful, diversionary reading. Although this orientation may have been formed as a culminating impression from those aspects of the reading experience that were memorable, it is subject to ongoing adjustment and change as different texts are encountered. Therefore, a ludic orientation may reflect changes in expectations as a reader engages on different occasions with what she categorizes as literature or fantasy.

The underlying source of the differences may also lie in disparity between the text- and person-based analyses. Text-based analysis drew out associations between reading events and the specific texts that readers indicated as recently read. Person-based analysis examined the associations between readers distinctly associated with reading events and the text categories that they indicated as frequently read. It could be that the text categories that readers identified were not reflected in the specific texts that they recalled reading, thereby leading to disparate results. The texts that participants initially listed in the first part of the questionnaire were specific fictional texts that they remembered reading within the past year. The texts that they remembered reading could differ from the self-designated textual categories that they indicated as reading often. It could be that a text is memorable for a reader exactly because it is not the type of fiction that is normally read, and so becomes notable as a result.

There are any number of factors that contribute to a text's memorability for a reader and it may have no relation to the kind of books that she regularly reads. The comparison between reading orientations and reader-designated texts and the comparison between readers and reader-designated text types are not symmetrical; the relationship between memorable text and reading orientation shows different results when compared to the relationship between frequently read text and reader. The association between ludic and educational orientations, and popular and literary fiction, respectively, as memorable texts, does not hold for the types of texts that readers turn to most often, in that the texts that readers pick up most frequently are not clearly associated with any distinct reader orientation.

Forms of Reading Engagement

Reading engagement, as measured by frequency of reading, reading-related discussion, and reading-related activities was used as an index of the memorability of the reading experience. For ludic exploratory readers, reading engagement for their most read type of text was predicted by other-oriented insight, and for educational exploratory readers, reading engagement was predicted by self-oriented insight. However, during reading experience itself (in contrast to the post-reading activities that define reading engagement) that is linked to reading outcomes, reading for insight into others was associated with self-perceptual depth in both groups. For both educational exploratory and ludic exploratory readers, self-perceptual depth in the case of their most read text type was associated with a sense of "insight into people and events."

Although self-perceptual depth was other-oriented in both reader groups, the form of that sense of insight into people and events may have a character that is reflective of each group. The locus of the other may be different, varying according to the language of affective judgment used to characterize each reader type. For ludic exploratory readers, it may entail engagement with the other in forms such as compassion, identification, or empathy, whereas for educational exploratory readers, the nature of the other is closer, potentially based within the intimacies of close relationships. Considered in terms of affective distance, the orientation toward the other is comparatively more distant for ludic exploratory readers, who may regard people and events as separate and removed from their orbit. In contrast, educational exploratory readers may feel closer to others in a blending or merging of feelings that goes beyond a detached kind of identification with the other. Although these characterizations are based in the nature of each reader orientation, it is prudent to recognize that the aforementioned differences in the other-oriented insight for each group are only hints at the present time. The character of each group may intimate the nature of their orientations toward others, but only further investigation of these groups will reveal more compelling evidence that can support or refute such claims.

The occurrence of self-perceptual depth as other-oriented for both ludic and educational exploratory readers may also reflect the exploratory aspect of these groups as one that reaches into the world of the text in the creation of personal meaning. While it may be that all forms of reading involve engagement with the text in a way that entails interaction between reactions to the world of the text and reader expectations, the

exploratory reader orientations may place greater emphasis on their understanding of the textual world such that their reading may involve greater interrogation of derived meaning. For this reason, the sense of self-perceptual depth that emerges out of exploratory readers' immersive, meaning-driven reading may be tied to a feeling of insight into others. This feeling of insight then becomes a memorable aspect of reading in the consolidation of the reader's progression in her attunement to the world of the text and how that progression in attunement is related to the world beyond the text. It goes on to form the set of expectations with which the reader returns to the everyday world and guides readers' articulation of their orientation as exploratory.

Reading Engagement as Memorability

While reading orientations concern those aspects of the reading experience articulated as memorable, reading engagement demonstrates memorability through activity around reading—reading, discussion or activity— such that readers return to a text with greater frequency. In this way, the forms of insight that predicted reading engagement in the two exploratory reader groups also guided the articulation of memorable features of the reading experience. For ludic exploratory readers, a sense of insight into the external world and the people in it guided the articulation of their reading experience, and so the return to fictional texts with greater frequency was associated with an exploration of people and external issues. On the other hand, an exploration of the internal world guided the articulation of reading experience for educational exploratory readers—an exploration of feelings, memories and values—so that frequent reading activity was associated with a feeling of insight into themselves.

At the outset of this study, memorability was considered to be a key part of the articulation of reading orientations, given that it is the memorable progressions in readers' attunement to the world of the text that are understood as ultimately forming the readers' self-understood orientations. While memorability, including the culmination of progression in reader attunement in the articulation of reading orientations, was implied in the classification of reading orientations, it was directly measured through the frequency of reading activities that collectively define reading engagement.

The measurement of memorability through a three-item reading activity frequency scale was perhaps the most direct way to consider this concept. Frequent activity is the clearest indication that readers are sufficiently engaged that they return to reading often, and regard their reading as relevant and memorable. The frequent turn to reading and related activities means simply that these activities are implicated in readers' lives and as a result, memorable.

Although such a measure of memorability is fairly direct in the sense that it clearly indicates whether reading is memorable or not, the converse is that such a measure is somewhat crude. The reflection of memorability in continued engagement is not finely tuned, and consequently, reading engagement may not be the most apt way to think about memorability. The entirety of this study is centered on the memorability of the reading experience—whether it has to do with specific texts read, reasons for reading, or reading outcomes—and in effect everything that readers report about their experience they do so because it is memorable.

However, to delve further into the memorability of reading, into progressions in reader attunement, it may be necessary to get closer to the reading experience. Further study could look more closely at the fluctuations in reader expectation and reaction in a particular reading experience to get a better understanding of the temporally unfolding interaction that occurs during reading. The study of a specific reading experience could trace more intimately the change in modes of attunement within a reading event to better determine the consolidation of the reader's self-understood orientation. The mapping of the sequence of changes in modes of attunement immediately after reading would give more insight into the process of reading as it becomes memorable for the reader. Further questioning of the reader about changes in expectations and reactions to the text would provide more information about fluctuations during reading and how these are implicated in the formation of memorable reading orientations.

Influence of Text Type

Reader-designated popular and literary fiction was associated with different forms of reading influence that accompanied self-perceptual depth. Reading outcomes describe some of the effects of reading engagement, and ultimately, how readers generate meaning in relation to a text and the world beyond. An examination of reading outcomes suggests that the experience of self-perceptual depth (understood as increased sensitivity, readiness to change, changed mood, and reconsideration of past events) occurs differently in the case of reader-designated popular fiction as compared to reader-designated literary fiction. Readers of popular fiction located self-perceptual depth in a sense of cultural

insight, whereas for literary fiction readers, self-perceptual depth was found through a sense of escape evoked in the act of reading.

When ludic exploratory and educational exploratory readers experience self-perceptual depth, their reading of both popular and literary fiction is characteristically other-oriented. That is, self-perceptual depth occurs for both ludic exploratory and educational exploratory reader groups in an other-oriented form. When these readers experience self-perceptual depth in their reading of popular fiction, their sense of insight into others may be associated with attempts to "learn about other cultures." On the other hand, when they experience self-perceptual depth in their reading of literary fiction, their sense of insight into others may occur through an "escape into a different world." Thus, self-perceptual depth occurs regardless of the reader orientation at stake, and is predicted by text type, as designated by non-experts, and in association with insight into others.

Considering Self-Perceptual Depth for Popular and Literary Fiction

Literary and popular fiction as designated by non-expert readers can be partly characterized by the distinct outcomes associated with each text type. For readers of popular fiction, self-perceptual depth associated with a sense of cultural insight may describe the narratives that help readers "resituate themselves in relation to the world" (McCracken, 1998). Readers' exploration of themselves through the world of the text in popular fiction may allow for the challenging of boundaries between inner and outer realities (Harrington & Bielby, 1995). The difference between reader expectation and reaction to a reality represented by culture in a text may motivate further engagement with that text. The textual reference to culture may be to a fantastic world and its

inhabitants rather than anything realistic, but it may be enough for the reader to begin a process of re-evaluation and further reading engagement. The enjoyment of reading may lie in that textual encounter, and it may constitute part of the pleasure of reading for exploratory reading orientations in particular.

Reading may be thought of as a kind of affective play, in which readers not only explore culture but also create it for themselves in relation to a text (Hills, 2002). Affective play may help to form a "new tradition or a set of biographical and historical resources which can be drawn on" (Hills, 2002) in the creation and re-creation of culture. Playful engagement with a text may meaningfully shape readers' conceptions of culture, and serve as the source from which further cultural production stems. It may guide the reflexive consolidation of the reader's attunement to the world of the text and the world beyond.

The playful reading of popular fiction may treat the fictional text as a transitional object in the same way that a child might treat a toy in Winnicot's (1971) account of play. Playful reading engagement may open up a "third space" in reading experience that serves as a "resting place for the individual engaged in the perpetual human task of keeping inner and outer reality separate yet interrelated" (Winnicot, 1971). The movement between inner and outer reality requires the mediation of transitional objects as a way of managing tensions between inner and outer worlds. Ongoing reader engagement of their inner world and the world of the text, of expectation and reaction, may correspond to the playful exploration of culture that uses the text as a transitional object.

A sense of insight into culture then may emerge from the interaction between reader expectation and reaction. For example, cultural insight as experienced by romance readers may reside in perceptions of culture suggestive of the foreign or exotic associated with models of romantic love. The romance may be situated in an exotic locale (signifying the reader's unknown) for purposes of titillation, and for vicarious travel and experiencing. Radway (1984) points to one function of romance as filling a "woman's mental world with the varied details of simulated travel and (permitting) her to converse imaginatively with adults from a broad spectrum of social space." The storyline and characters may incorporate unfamiliar elements and set up an encounter with unknown experiences for the reader, thus facilitating a sense of insight into novel aspects of culture.

For fantasy or horror readers, reading engagement that challenges inner and outer boundaries may possess a utopian quality, or the ability to "gesture to a better world" (McCracken, 1998). The textual encounter with fantastic elements that transgress reality or create it may be the cultural experience that resituates these readers in relation to the world (McCracken, 1998). The ability to conceive of a different world from the one that the reader inhabits opens up the possibility of self-perceptual insight as the reader reconsiders himself in opposition to the reality brought about through reading.

The association of meaning with escape for readers of literary fiction is surprising, if only because escape is traditionally associated with popular fiction in the idea of escapism. Miall and Kuiken's (1995) finding of a relationship between leisure escape and experiental reading (e.g., reading for insight, imaginative involvement) is one exception

in this regard, although it is an incongruity that has not been resolved. This lack of resolution means that popular fiction alone continues to be conventionally associated with escape and diversion. The reading orientation approach to genre allows for movement away from such conjecture, and opens up new possibilities for the understanding of reading. The association of escape with self-perceptual depth in the reading of reader-designated literary fiction suggests that readers may be using a sense of escape to facilitate immersion during reading, and in this way leading to self-oriented insight.

Within studies of aesthetic experience, the concept of aesthetic attitude is used to describe a form of disinterestedness whereby an aesthetic object is considered by itself without regard for any practical purpose it might serve (Stolnitz, 1960). Such an approach is critical in the facilitation of absorption as a precondition for aesthetic experience, which in turn enables a return to familiar conceptions with a transformed understanding. Exploratory readers may be approaching designated literary fiction in an aesthetic manner in the sense that the anticipation of escape puts aside any practical expectations placed on the text. Reading with an emphasis on escape likewise facilitates absorption or immersion in the act of reading, making the aesthetic experience more easily accessible. Once readers leave behind the world of the text, they may find that they return to their own sense of reality with a changed perception of themselves and the world around them. The reader's understanding of her attunement to the world of the text and how that attunement is related to the world beyond the text may thus be altered.

Future Research

The association of educational and ludic exploratory reader orientations with self- and other-oriented forms of reading engagement, respectively, and the variant ways that popular and literary fiction are taken up by readers all necessitate future study. The results of the current study suggest that the orientation through which a text is read plays a critical role in its classification and understanding by non-expert readers. As indicated in the results of the reading questionnaire, readers endorse a variety of reading orientations for fictional texts, despite the classification of commercial and expert authorities. What makes a text memorable for a reader and how it functions in reading experience occurs as part of a reading orientation over and above its formal classification.

It may be especially useful to consider exploratory readers and the ways in which they engage with fictional texts to gain a better understanding of active forms of reading. The results indicate that people read in predictable forms, whether purely for the sake of pleasure or out of obligation, but also that some people go beyond more basic forms of reading to engage more deeply with texts, as indicated by exploratory forms of reader orientations. These readers challenge their understanding of the texts they encounter and of themselves by engaging in discussion with others, searching for insight, and seeking out intellectual challenge. Especially in the epistemic reader groups, readers turn to fiction in a pursuit to learn more about themselves and the world around them.

The form of analysis in this study that created reader types in correspondence with reading orientations was informative of the primary ways in which readers orient themselves toward the texts they read. However, future studies can also take into

consideration forms of analysis that create mixed types of readers rather than types that are congruent with reading orientations. The examination of readers from a different angle provides an opportunity to gain further information about the nuances of the approaches taken to reading when considered in terms of mixed rather than uniform reader types.

The present study was an initial articulation of reading orientations conceived as culminating impressions of the reading experience for everyday readers, and as the sets of expectations with which they return to the everyday world. The creation of reader profiles on the basis of their reasons for reading is a first step toward an explication of those aspects of reading that are memorable and consequently implicated in the approaches taken by readers toward different texts. Reading orientations as set out by this study referred to the fluctuation of expectations that occurs during reading and the continuing movement between reader expectation and reaction to text structure.

However, the surveying of readers about the memorable aspects of their reading experience after the experience accessed only that culminating impression of their reading engagement. In order to remain faithful to the conception of reading orientations as dynamic, as involving temporally unfolding interactions through which the reader's attunement to the world of the text is progressively altered, further study needs to consider reader approaches to reading before, during and after the event. Not only do readers need to be questioned further about their reading practices and impressions, investigation needs to get closer to the experience itself. Only then will the combination of experiences surrounding the act of reading—expectations, engagement, and

outcome—be better understood, leading to better comprehension of the reading orientations that provide a novel ground for the study of genre.

References

Allen, R. (1989). Bursting bubbles: "Soap opera" audiences and the limits of genre. In E. Seiter, H. Borchers, G. Kreutzner & E. Warth (Eds.), *Remote Control: Television, Audiences and Cultural Power* (pp. 44-55). London: Routledge.

Barsch, A. (1997). Young People Reading Popular/Commercial Fiction. In S. Totosy de Zepetnek & I. Sywenky (Eds.), *The Systemic and Empirical Approach to Literature and Culture as Theory and Application* (pp. 371-383). Edmonton: LUMIS Publications.

Beckner, M. (1959). *The biological way of thought*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Chandler, D. (1997). *An Introduction to Genre Theory*. Retrieved August 29, 2003, from http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/Documents/intgenre/intgenre.html.

Dixon, P., & Bortolussi, M. (2003). *What do readers and critics know about popular genre?* Paper presented at Winter Text Conference, Jackson Hole, WY.

Fowler, A. (1989). Genre. In E. Barnouw (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of Communications, Vol. 2* (pp. 215-217). New York: Oxford University Press.

Harrington, C. & Bielby, D. (1995). *Soap Fans: Pursuing Pleasure and Making Meaning in Everyday Life*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Hills, M. (2002). *Fan Cultures*. New York: Routledge.

Knight, D. (1994). Making Sense of Genre. *Film and Philosophy, 2, 1-15*, Retrieved August 29, 2003, from http://hanover.edu/philos/film/vol_02/knight.htm.

Lazarsfeld, P., & Henry, N. (1968) *Latent Structure Analysis*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Livingstone, S. (1994). The Rise and Fall of Audience Research: An Old Story With a New Ending. In M.R. Levy & M. Gurevitch (Eds.), *Defining media studies: reflections on the future of the field* (pp. 247-254). New York: Oxford University Press.

McCracken, S. (1998). *Pulp: Reading popular fiction*. New York: Manchester University Press.

Miall, S. D. & Kuiken, D. (1995). Aspects of Literary Response: A New Questionnaire. *Research in the Teaching of English, 29, 37-58.*

Radway, J.A. (1984). *Reading the Romance: Women, Patriarchy, and Popular Literature*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Rosch, E. (1975). Cognitive representations of semantic categories. *Journal of Experimental Psychology (General), 104*, 192-233.

Stolnitz, J. (1960). *Aesthetics and philosophy of art criticism*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Tolkien, J. (1954). *The Lord of the Rings*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Winnicot, D. (1971). *Playing and Reality*, London: Penguin.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical investigations* (G.E.M. Anscombe, Trans.). Oxford: B. Blackwell.

Appendix A

Reading Fiction: A Questionnaire
Part I
University of Alberta 2003

This questionnaire is designed to study aspects of your reading experience, especially your experience of reading fiction. Some of the questions are open-ended; the answers to these items can be written directly on the questionnaire in the spaces provided. Other questions ask you to make ratings; for these items, consider carefully the rating scale provided and then indicate your answer by blackening the corresponding circle on the first attached green answer sheet.

In the spaces provided below, *please list the titles (and, if possible, the authors) of up to four fictional texts that you remember reading during the past year*.

- Do not include non-fictional texts (e.g., newspapers, autobiography, history, etc.).
- If you remember reading more than four fictional texts during the past year, list the four that are *most memorable*.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

- The questions on the next few pages ask about the texts that you listed above. Please detach this page to use as a reference as you answer the remainder of the questionnaire.

Questions About the Texts That You Just Listed

The following statements describe reasons that are sometimes given for reading fictional texts. On the green answer sheet, rate the extent to which each statement is true of your reasons for reading the ***first*** fictional text that you listed on page 1 of this questionnaire.

Use the following scale: 0 = not at all true to 4 = extremely true

I READ THIS TEXT...

1.	To relax	0 1 2 3 4
2.	Because I expected to enjoy the excitement and suspense	0 1 2 3 4
3.	To think about personal problems	0 1 2 3 4
4.	Because it was important for my education	0 1 2 3 4
5.	To gain insight into my own thoughts, feelings, and actions	0 1 2 3 4
6.	Because I expected to be captivated by the events in a story	0 1 2 3 4
7.	Because I wanted to be entertained	0 1 2 3 4
8.	To get new ideas about things that might actually happen	0 1 2 3 4
9.	To gain insight into others' thoughts, feelings, and actions	0 1 2 3 4
10.	To get away from my everyday problems and concerns	0 1 2 3 4
11.	Because I thought I could identify with the characters	0 1 2 3 4
12.	Because I thought I could vividly imagine the situations described there	0 1 2 3 4
13.	Because of its language style	0 1 2 3 4
14.	To use my imagination	0 1 2 3 4
15.	To learn more about the author's perspective and concerns	0 1 2 3 4
16.	To improve my understanding of what really happens in the world	0 1 2 3 4
17.	Because I expected it to further my personal development	0 1 2 3 4
18.	Because it had nothing to do with everyday reality	0 1 2 3 4
19.	Because I wanted to talk about this text with others who have read it	0 1 2 3 4
20.	Because I expected to be challenged intellectually	0 1 2 3 4
21.	To consider other ways that I might lead my own life	0 1 2 3 4
22.	To compare this text with others texts by the same or different authors	0 1 2 3 4
23.	Because it was required reading in a course	0 1 2 3 4
24.	Because of its vivid description of people, situations, and events	0 1 2 3 4

On the green answer sheet, rate the extent to which each of the following statements is true of your reasons for reading the ***second*** fictional text that you listed on page 1 of this questionnaire.

Use the following scale: 0 = not at all true to 4 = extremely true

I READ THIS TEXT...

25.	To relax	0 1 2 3 4
26.	Because I expected to enjoy the excitement and suspense	0 1 2 3 4
27.	To think about personal problems	0 1 2 3 4
28.	Because it was important for my education	0 1 2 3 4
29.	To gain insight into my own thoughts, feelings, and actions	0 1 2 3 4
30.	Because I expected to be captivated by the events in a story	0 1 2 3 4
31.	Because I wanted to be entertained	0 1 2 3 4
32.	To get new ideas about things that might actually happen	0 1 2 3 4
33.	To gain insight into others' thoughts, feelings, and actions	0 1 2 3 4
34.	To get away from my everyday problems and concerns	0 1 2 3 4
35.	Because I thought I could identify with the characters	0 1 2 3 4
36.	Because I thought I could vividly imagine the situations described there	0 1 2 3 4
37.	Because of its language style	0 1 2 3 4
38.	To use my imagination	0 1 2 3 4
39.	To learn more about the author's perspective and concerns	0 1 2 3 4
40.	To improve my understanding of what really happens in the world	0 1 2 3 4
41.	Because I expected it to further my personal development	0 1 2 3 4
42.	Because it had nothing to do with everyday reality	0 1 2 3 4
43.	Because I wanted to talk about this text with others who have read it	0 1 2 3 4
44.	Because I expected to be challenged intellectually	0 1 2 3 4
45.	To consider other ways that I might lead my own life	0 1 2 3 4
46.	To compare this text with other texts by the same or different authors	0 1 2 3 4
47.	Because it was required reading in a course	0 1 2 3 4
48.	Because of its vivid description of people, situations, and events	0 1 2 3 4

On the green answer sheet, rate the extent to which each of the following statements is true of your reasons for reading the ***third*** fictional text that you listed on page 1 of this questionnaire.

Use the following scale: 0 = not at all true to 4 = extremely true

I READ THIS TEXT...

49.	To relax	0 1 2 3 4
50.	Because I expected to enjoy the excitement and suspense	0 1 2 3 4
51.	To think about personal problems	0 1 2 3 4
52.	Because it was important for my education	0 1 2 3 4
53.	To gain insight into my own thoughts, feelings, and actions	0 1 2 3 4
54.	Because I expected to be captivated by the events in a story	0 1 2 3 4
55.	Because I wanted to be entertained	0 1 2 3 4
56.	To get new ideas about things that might actually happen	0 1 2 3 4
57.	To gain insight into others' thoughts, feelings, and actions	0 1 2 3 4
58.	To get away from my everyday problems and concerns	0 1 2 3 4
59.	Because I thought I could identify with the characters	0 1 2 3 4
60.	Because I thought I could vividly imagine the situations described there	0 1 2 3 4
61.	Because of its language style	0 1 2 3 4
62.	To use my imagination	0 1 2 3 4
63.	To learn more about the author's perspective and concerns	0 1 2 3 4
64.	To improve my understanding of what really happens in the world	0 1 2 3 4
65.	Because I expected it to further my personal development	0 1 2 3 4
66.	Because it had nothing to do with everyday reality	0 1 2 3 4
67.	Because I wanted to talk about this text with others who have read it	0 1 2 3 4
68.	Because I expected to be challenged intellectually	0 1 2 3 4
69.	To consider other ways that I might lead my own life	0 1 2 3 4
70.	To compare this text with other texts by the same or different authors	0 1 2 3 4
71.	Because it was required reading in a course	0 1 2 3 4
72.	Because of its vivid description of people, situations, and events	0 1 2 3 4

On the green answer sheet, rate the extent to which each of the following statements is true of your reasons for reading the ***fourth*** fictional text that you listed on page 1 of this questionnaire.

Use the following scale: 0 = not at all true to 4 = extremely true

I READ THIS TEXT...

73.	To relax	0 1 2 3 4
74.	Because I expected to enjoy the excitement and suspense	0 1 2 3 4
75.	To think about personal problems	0 1 2 3 4
76.	Because it was important for my education	0 1 2 3 4
77.	To gain insight into my own thoughts, feelings, and actions	0 1 2 3 4
78.	Because I expected to be captivated by the events in a story	0 1 2 3 4
79.	Because I wanted to be entertained	0 1 2 3 4
80.	To get new ideas about things that might actually happen	0 1 2 3 4
81.	To gain insight into others' thoughts, feelings, and actions	0 1 2 3 4
82.	To get away from my everyday problems and concerns	0 1 2 3 4
83.	Because I thought I could identify with the characters	0 1 2 3 4
84.	Because I thought I could vividly imagine the situations described there	0 1 2 3 4
85.	Because of its language style	0 1 2 3 4
86.	To use my imagination	0 1 2 3 4
87.	To learn more about the author's perspective and concerns	0 1 2 3 4
88.	To improve my understanding of what really happens in the world	0 1 2 3 4
89.	Because I expected it to further my personal development	0 1 2 3 4
90.	Because it had nothing to do with everyday reality	0 1 2 3 4
91.	Because I wanted to talk about this text with others who have read it	0 1 2 3 4
92.	Because I expected to be challenged intellectually	0 1 2 3 4
93.	To consider other ways that I might lead my own life	0 1 2 3 4
94.	To compare this text with other texts by the same or different authors	0 1 2 3 4
95.	Because it was required reading in a course	0 1 2 3 4
96.	Because of its vivid description of people, situations, and events	0 1 2 3 4

For the ***first text*** that you listed on page 1, indicate to which of the following categories it *most nearly belongs* by placing a checkmark in the appropriate box.

Comics	☐	Westerns	☐
Romances	☐	Crime novels	☐
Fantasy	☐	Hyperfiction	☐
Short stories	☐	Poetry	☐
Fairy tales	☐	Historical novels	☐
Literary novels	☐	Science fiction	☐
Fictional diaries	☐	Dramas	☐

Other (please describe): _____

Please explain why you chose this category for the first text that you listed, i.e., what features make it the kind of text that it is?

_____
_____
_____
_____

For the ***second text*** that you listed on page 1, indicate to which of the following categories it *most nearly belongs* by placing a checkmark in the appropriate box.

Comics	☐	Westerns	☐
Romances	☐	Crime novels	☐
Fantasy	☐	Hyperfiction	☐
Short stories	☐	Poetry	☐
Fairy tales	☐	Historical novels	☐
Literary novels	☐	Science fiction	☐
Fictional diaries	☐	Dramas	☐

Other (please describe): _____

Please explain why you chose this category for the second text that you listed, i.e., what features make it the kind of text that it is?

_____
_____
_____
_____

For the ***third text*** that you listed on page 1, indicate to which of the following categories it *most nearly belongs* by placing a checkmark in the appropriate box.

Comics	☐	Westerns	☐
Romances	☐	Crime novels	☐
Fantasy	☐	Hyperfiction	☐
Short stories	☐	Poetry	☐
Fairy tales	☐	Historical novels	☐
Literary novels	☐	Science fiction	☐
Fictional diaries	☐	Dramas	☐

Other (please describe): _____

Please explain why you chose this category for the third text that you listed, i.e., what features make it the kind of text that it is?

_____
_____
_____
_____

For the ***fourth text*** that you listed on page 1, indicate to which of the following categories it *most nearly belongs* by placing a checkmark in the appropriate box.

Comics	☐	Westerns	☐
Romances	☐	Crime novels	☐
Fantasy	☐	Hyperfiction	☐
Short stories	☐	Poetry	☐
Fairy tales	☐	Historical novels	☐
Literary novels	☐	Science fiction	☐
Fictional diaries	☐	Dramas	☐

Other (please describe): _____

Please explain why you chose this category for the fourth text that you listed, i.e., what features make it the kind of text that it is?

_____
_____
_____
_____

Reading Fiction: A Questionnaire
Part II
University of Alberta 2003

This questionnaire is designed to study aspects of your reading experience, especially your experience of reading fiction. Some of the questions are open-ended; the answers to these items can be written directly on the questionnaire in the spaces provided. Other questions ask you to make ratings; for these items, consider carefully the rating scale provided and then indicate your answer by blackening the corresponding circle on the second attached green answer sheet.

Using the terms provided below, please select the ***two*** categories of fictional texts that you most frequently read. For the category of text that you ***most frequently read***, place a "1" next to the label for that category. Then, for the category of fictional text that you ***next most frequently read***, place a "2" next to the label for that category.

Comics	____	Westerns	____
Romances	____	Crime novels	____
Fantasy	____	Hyperfiction	____
Short stories	____	Poetry	____
Fairy tales	____	Historical novels	____
Literary novels	____	Science fiction	____
Fictional diaries	____	Dramas	____
Other (please describe): _____			____

- The questions on the next few pages ask about the categories of texts that you selected above. Please detach this page to use as a reference as you answer the remainder of the questionnaire.

Section I
Questions About the Kind of Fictional Text that You Read Most Frequently

For the *category of fictional text that you read **most frequently*** (i.e., the one you just marked "1"), please answer the following questions, using the green answer sheet to record your answers.

97. During the last three years, about how often have you read fictional texts from this category?

0 = rarely (once a year)
1 = sometimes (2 to 3 times each year)
2 = frequently (4 times each year to 1 time each month)
3 = often (2 to 3 times a month)
4 = all the time (one or more times a week)

98. When you read this kind of fictional text, for how long do you typically read?

0 = 15 minutes or less
1 = 15 to 30 minutes
2 = 30 to 60 minutes
3 = 1 to 2 hours
4 = over 2 hours

99. When you read this kind of fictional text, do you ever discuss what you have read with others?

0 = rarely or never
1 = occasionally
2 = frequently
3 = very often
4 = extremely often

If you answered 1-4, where and with whom?

_____

_____

_____

When you read this kind of fictional text, do you ever *avoid* discussing what you have read with others?

0 = rarely or never
1 = occasionally
2 = frequently
3 = very often
4 = extremely often

If you answered 1-4, when and why?

_____
_____
_____

100. Do you take part in any other activities related to your reading of this kind of fictional text?

0 = rarely or never
1 = occasionally
2 = frequently
3 = very often
4 = extremely often

If you answered 1-4, what are these activities?

_____
_____
_____

In the space below, describe what you find most ***enjoyable*** about reading this kind of text.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

In the space below, describe what you find most ***interesting*** about reading this kind of text.

_____
_____
_____
_____

On the green answer sheet, rate your general perception of this kind of text, using the following scales:

101.	very displeasing	0	1	2	3	4	very pleasing
102.	very cold	0	1	2	3	4	very warm
103.	very boring	0	1	2	3	4	very interesting
104.	very simple	0	1	2	3	4	very complex
105.	not at all emotional	0	1	2	3	4	very emotional
106.	not at all meaningful	0	1	2	3	4	very meaningful
107.	not at all familiar	0	1	2	3	4	very familiar

13. Reading fictional texts can influence readers' thoughts, feelings, and actions between reading sessions and/or after they have finished reading the text. Do texts from this category influence you in this way?

0 = rarely or never
1 = occasionally
2 = frequently
3 = very often
4 = every (or almost every) time

If you answered 1-4, describe how texts from this category influenced your thoughts, feelings, and actions between reading sessions or after you finished reading. Give specific examples where possible.

_____
_____
_____
_____

The following statements describe some of the ways in which fictional texts can influence readers afterwards. On the green answer sheet, rate the extent to which each statement describes your reading of this kind of text.

Use the following scale: 0 = not at all true to 4 = extremely true

BY READING TEXTS FROM THIS CATEGORY...

14.	I became sensitive to aspects of my life that I usually ignore	0 1 2 3 4
15.	I learned about other cultures	0 1 2 3 4
16.	I began to feel like changing the way I live	0 1 2 3 4
17.	I was reminded of some of my most deeply held values	0 1 2 3 4
18.	My mood was changed for hours, or even days, afterwards	0 1 2 3 4
19.	I gained insight into people and events in my world	0 1 2 3 4
20.	I felt like a somewhat different person for hours, or even days, afterwards	0 1 2 3 4
21.	I was able to escape into a different world	0 1 2 3 4
22.	I began to reconsider some events in my past	0 1 2 3 4

Section II
Questions About the Kind of Fictional Text that You Read Next Most Frequently

For the *category of fictional text that you read **next most frequently*** (i.e., the one you previously marked "2"), please answer the following questions, using the green answer sheet to record your answers.

23. During the last three years, about how often have you read fictional texts from this category?

0 = rarely (once a year)
1 = sometimes (2 to 3 times each year)
2 = frequently (4 times each year to 1 time each month)
3 = often (2 to 3 times a month)
4 = all the time (one or more times a week)

24. When you read this kind of fictional text, for how long do you typically read?

0 = 15 minutes or less
1 = 15 to 30 minutes
2 = 30 to 60 minutes
3 = 1 to 2 hours
4 = over 2 hours

25. When you read this kind of fictional text, do you ever discuss what you have read with others?

0 = rarely or never
1 = occasionally
2 = frequently
3 = very often
4 = extremely often

If you answered 1-4, where and with whom?

_____

_____

_____

When you read this kind of fictional text, do you ever *avoid* discussing what you have read with others?

0 = rarely or never
1 = occasionally
2 = frequently
3 = very often
4 = extremely often

If you answered 1-4, when and why?

_____
_____
_____

26. Do you take part in any other activities related to your reading of this kind of fictional text?

0 = rarely or never
1 = occasionally
2 = frequently
3 = very often
4 = extremely often

If you answered 1-4, what are these activities?

_____
_____
_____

In the space below, describe what you find most ***enjoyable*** about reading this kind of text.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

In the space below, describe what you find most ***interesting*** about reading this kind of text.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

On the green answer sheet, rate your general perception of this kind of text, using the following scales:

27.	very displeasing	0	1	2	3	4	very pleasing
28.	very cold	0	1	2	3	4	very warm
29.	very boring	0	1	2	3	4	very interesting
30.	very simple	0	1	2	3	4	very complex
31.	not at all emotional	0	1	2	3	4	very emotional
32.	not at all meaningful	0	1	2	3	4	very meaningful
33.	not at all familiar	0	1	2	3	4	very familiar

34. Reading fictional texts can influence readers' thoughts, feelings, and actions between reading sessions and/or after they have finished reading the text. Do texts from this category influence you in this way?

0 = rarely or never
1 = occasionally
2 = frequently
3 = very often
4 = every (or almost every) time

If you answered 1-4, describe how texts from this category influenced your thoughts, feelings, and actions between reading sessions or after you finished reading. Give specific examples where possible.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

The following statements describe some of the ways in which fictional texts can influence readers afterwards. On the green answer sheet, rate the extent to which each statement describes your reading of this kind of text.

Use the following scale: 0 = not at all true to 4 = extremely true

BY READING TEXTS FROM THIS CATEGORY...

35.	I became sensitive to aspects of my life that I usually ignore	0 1 2 3 4
36.	I learned about other cultures	0 1 2 3 4
37.	I began to feel like changing the way I live	0 1 2 3 4
38.	I was reminded of some of my most deeply held values	0 1 2 3 4
39.	My mood was changed for hours, or even days, afterwards	0 1 2 3 4
40.	I gained insight into people and events in my world	0 1 2 3 4
41.	I felt like a somewhat different person for hours, or even days, afterwards	0 1 2 3 4
42.	I was able to escape into a different world	0 1 2 3 4
43.	I began to reconsider some events in my past	0 1 2 3 4

Appendix B

Correspondence between Reading Orientations and Reader-Designated Text Labels

Reading Orientation Agreement with Non-Expert Designated Text Labels

Reading Orientation		Non-Expert Designated Text													
		Comic	Romanc	Fantasy	Short	Fairy	Literary	Fictional Diary	Crime	Poetry	Historic	Scifi	Drama	Other	Total
(1) Pure Ludic	Observed	0	7	26*	2	0	2	8	14	0	1	9	6	19	94
	Expected	2.5	5.6	12.1	7.9	.7	22.2	5.1	4.0	.7	9.1	6.7	8.9	8.6	94
(2) Ludic Explore	Observed	1	7	26*	3	1	13	3	6	0	5	5	5	4	79
	Expected	2.1	4.7	10.2	6.6	.6	18.7	4.3	3.4	.6	7.6	5.6	7.5	7.2	79
(3) Pure Education	Observed	4	6	3	14	0	40*	3	0	1	12	9	14	10	116
	Expected	3.0	6.9	14.9	9.7	.9	27.4	6.3	5.0	.9	11.2	8.2	11.0	10.6	116
(4) Education Explore	Observed	5	8	5	18*	2	48*	1	0	3	21*	9	11	5	136
	Expected	3.5	8.1	17.5	11.4	1.0	32.2	7.3	5.8	1.0	13.2	9.6	12.9	12.4	136
(5) Epistemic	Observed	1	1	3	5	0	12	4	0	0	8	1	9	4	48
	Expected	1.3	2.9	6.2	4.0	.4	11.4	2.6	2.1	.4	4.6	3.4	4.6	4.4	48
(6) Moderate	Observed	3	3	6	3	1	12	10	3	0	5	5	6	7	64
	Expected	1.7	3.8	8.2	5.4	.5	15.1	3.5	2.7	.5	6.2	4.5	6.1	5.8	64
Total	Observed	14	32	69	45	4	127	29	23	4	52	38	51	49	537
	Expected	14	32	69	45	4	127	29	23	4	52	38	51	49	537

* = $p < .05$

Reading Orientation Agreement with Expert-Designated Text Labels

		Expert Designated Text													
Reading Orientation		Comic	Romanc	Fantasy	Short	Lit	Fiction Diary	Crime	Hyper	Poetry	Historic	Scifi	Drama	Other	Total
(1) Pure Ludic	Observed	0	5	34*	2	10	3	16*	0	0	1	2	1	17*	91
	Expected	.5	2.4	11.8	6.7	45.9	1.0	4.8	.2	.9	.7	1.9	6.3	7.9	91
(2) Ludic Explore	Observed	0	8	22*	1	20	1	7	0	0	2	4	1	10	76
	Expected	.4	2.0	9.9	5.6	38.4	.9	4.0	.1	.7	.6	1.6	5.3	6.6	76
(3) Pure Education	Observed	3	0	1	12	85*	0	0	0	1	0	1	13*	1	117
	Expected	.7	3.1	15.2	8.6	59.1	1.3	6.2	.2	1.1	.9	2.4	8.2	10.1	117
(4) Education Explore	Observed	0	0	2	12	97*	0	1	1	4	0	0	18*	2	137
	Expected	.8	3.6	17.8	10.1	69.1	1.5	7.2	.3	1.3	1.0	2.8	9.5	11.9	137
(5) Epistemic	Observed	0	0	4	7	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	49
	Expected	.3	1.3	6.4	3.6	24.7	.6	2.6	.1	.5	.4	1.0	3.4	4.2	49
(6) Moderate	Observed	0	1	6	5	25	2	4	0	0	1	4	1	12*	61
	Expected	.3	1.6	7.9	4.5	30.8	.7	3.2	.1	.6	.5	1.3	4.3	5.3	61
Total	Observed	3	14	69	39	268	6	28	1	5	4	11	37	46	531
	Expected	3	14	69	39	268	6	28	1	5	4	11	37	46	531

* = $p < .05$